

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/960,548	IGAKURA, TOMOHIRO	
	Examiner Susan Y. Chen	Art Unit 2161	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Susan Y. Chen. (3) _____.

(2) Jan R. Blum. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 April 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Patent No. 6,560,631.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner contacted applicant's attorney based on the request on the amendment filed on 03/31/2005 and directed applicant's attention to the mappings of the prior art and the claimed subject matters. Applicant responded that he could not access the claim language during the conversation and would callback to address his concerns, however, there was no follow-up responses, thus, the examiner assumes applicant agrees with the examiner's mapping.



UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER